

THE NEWS IN LONDON.

NO MATERIAL CHANGE AT PRESENT

FROM THAT OF HIS PREDECESSOR.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S MEMORABLE WORDS AT
ST. JAMES'S HALL—AN APPEAL TO THE PEOPLES
WHICH BETOKENS A NEW ERA IN
POLITICS AND IN THE HISTORY

OF THE KINGDOM.
(BY CABLE TO THE THIRDS.)
(Copyright: 1894. By The Tribune Association.)

London, March 24.—It is now possible to form some notion of the aim and policy of the new Government, and of the extent to which it differs from Mr. Gladstone's. Lord Rosebery has supplemented both his Foreign Office speech to the Liberal Members of the House of Commons at his speech the same afternoon in the House of Lords. He has spoken at Edinburgh, and has spoken in London. He has stated his views with frankness. The frankness is so marked that Mr. Chamberlain, who followed him in Edinburgh, said it cynical; but Mr. Chamberlain's adjective is apt to be highly spoken.

The first thing which comes out clearly is Lord Rosebery's loyalty to his late leader, from whom he took over his present inheritance. Mr. Chamberlain describes it as a heritage of woe. This is a world in which woe and woe are common. The true question is, which predominates. Lord Rosebery is at any rate too much of a man of the world not to accept the condition in which he finds himself. To require what he might have done if he had not actually been here is to venture on the region of speculative policies.

He inherited a Cabinet, a Parliament and a policy. He has rearranged his Cabinet in part, and his policy he has rearranged in part.

him to do; but it remains the same Cabinet minus Mr. Gladstone and plus Lord Tweedmouth. None of the changes in office imply change in measures.

rather in the House of Commons, was but a narrow surplus. A new Prime Minister with so narrow a surplus as that must choose between two methods. He must preserve it intact, or he must dissolve. As he was not ready to dissolve, he had to a

to himself to keep his own counsel, and to diverge from the policy of his party in the House of Commons. I cannot himself lead. His speech, and especially his explanation of his speech in the House of Lords, have to be read in the light of that necessity. There is nothing in any of them to indicate the least intention of departing from the policy which is the policy of the party. There is, if anything, too marked a deference to the party and to certain sections of it whose loyalty may be thought to depend on circumstances. Making allowance for the stress of circumstances, we can discern the policy of the present Ministry pretty clearly. They do not change. It is clearly not in principles but in methods, and, in doctrine but in spirit, not in substance but, perhaps, in the order of the procedure.

First of all, Home Rule is hung up indefinitely. But, as Mr. Gladstone had already hung it up indefinitely, there is no novelty in that. The excuse, nevertheless, is the difficulty which creat-

me excitement last week among the Traditionalists: The declaration by Lord Rosebery in the House of Lords that Home Rule would not pass till England, as the predominant partner of the three Kingdoms, should be convinced of its justice. With the Edinburgh group on that declaration you are already familiar. It was made last Saturday evening. Lord Rosebery stands by his words, but he puts an interpretation on them different from that of those who heard them or read them; different from that of critics and friends alike. He is entitled to do that. He is entitled to say what he meant, if his words did not express what he meant.

The attempt to reconcile the two is perhaps academic. Mr. Balfour described it as an attempt to explain the unexplainable. Mr. Goschen said with point that though Lord Rosebery was not a hypocrite, he was a liar.

entitled to explain his own words, and he was
entitled to explain away Lord Salisbury's, which he declared himself in entire accord. Mr Chamberlain alleges that even the new statement leaves the Prime Minister a conditional Home Ruler, and that, as in 1893, the English majority had not been reduced to 45, and that the whole majority in the House of Commons for Home Rule was not even the half of 100, Lord

rosbery ought not to have voted for the original Bill, and cannot condemn the Lords for rejecting it. A logical or scientific explanation is one thing, an explanation adjusted to the exigencies of practical politics is another. What Lord Rosbery now says is that the process of bringing a Bill to the heart of England ought not to proceed until the English majority against Home Rule is reduced from 73, where it now stands, to 45, or 45. That would leave, or might leave, a plain majority of 100, and a majority of 100 is or ought to be the status of the House of Lords upon

With this modification of his former statement

The Irish Nationalists profess themselves content. Mr. Dillon is content, and Mr. Healy is content, and as they are the leaders of the two wings of the party over which Mr. McCarthy presides, their benediction ought to be sufficient to ensure their benediction. Mr. Redmond apparently is not content, and his discontent undoubtedly constitutes a danger to the Government and the greater danger since Mr. Redmond's influence in Ireland is said to be increasing. He has nine votes in the House of Commons. Mr. Labouchere, who has now gone openly into opposition, seems able to muster eight more on an emergency. Whether he could muster them for

his avowed purpose of turning out the Minnists is doubtful. If he could, and if he formed an alliance for that purpose with Mr. Redmond, the

Ministerial majority would be reduced to one
two, and a dissolution would be inevitable. Y
of anything is certain, it is that the Ministr
do not mean or expect to dissolve this summe
They must, therefore, have some reason for b
believing that the threatened Redmond-Labor
where cabal will prove innocuous. Nothing, a
any rate, could be clearer than Lord Rosebery

The question of the House of Lords was dealt with in a way which seems to have satisfied the Radicals, who want to abolish it. Yet abolition like Home Rule, is indefinitely postponed. The existence of the Upper Chamber in its present

form is, in Lord Rosebery's opinion, a great danger to the State, but it may be inferred that he believes it still possible to mend rather than to end the House. He is, at any rate, for a Second Chamber of some kind, very strongly for it.

and he leaves the whole subject for the serious consideration of the whole Liberal party. He offers no proposal and no suggestion. "If it is to be dealt with by the present Government, it can only be dealt with by the backing and support of the Liberal party."

That is a significant and far-reaching declaration. It is a distinct matter to the Abolitionists

It is a distinct notice to the Abandonment
that no initiative will come from the Ministry
it means, I judge, this: That if the Radical